

error of law or to prevent manifest injustice. Although Plaintiffs have today submitted a filing which they characterize as “EVIDENCE IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO OPEN/RE-CONSIDER AND/OR SET ASIDE JUDGMENT” (Document No. 30), it is neither new, relevant nor of any substantive meaning to the issue(s) at hand. Rather, Plaintiffs continue to advance the same arguments they made in their response to the motion to dismiss and said arguments were previously given due consideration and rejected by this Court. Therefore, the Court finds that the arguments raised in the instant motion do not warrant further analytical discussion.

Fatal to the pending motion, nothing new has been supplemented to the record by the Motion for Reconsideration of the Memorandum Opinion and Order of June 13, 2007.

AND NOW, this 28th day of June, 2007, it is hereby **ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED** that the MOTION TO THE HONORABLE COURT TO OPEN AND RECONSIDER DECISION AND/OR AS AN ALTERNATIVE/ MOTION TO SET ASIDE JUDGMENT filed by Plaintiffs is hereby **DENIED**.

BY THE COURT:

s/Terrence F. McVerry
United States District Court Judge

cc: George Scheib
815 Walbridge Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15220

Carole L. Scheib
815 Walbridge Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15220

Jayme L. Butcher, Esquire
Email: jbutcher@reedsmith.com